

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are pending in the present application. With this amendment, claims 2, 6-9, 11, 14, 16, and 19-20 have been canceled, and claims 1, 3-4, 10, 12, 15, and 17-18 have been amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner states:

**Regarding claims 1-8**, these claims recite a method of validating transaction requests, but fails to recite a tangible result, a requirement for compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 5 101 for a process that can be interpreted as being implemented through software. For a result to be tangible, it must be more than just a thought or a computation, i.e. it must have real-world value rather than an abstract result. See *GOTTSCALK, Comr. Pats. v. BENSON et al. (US SupCt) 175 USPQ 673 at 676-77* (invention ineligible because it had "no substantial practical application"). For instance, an additional step that included either displaying the validated result or error to the user.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 15 to describe the data processing system transforming the transaction requests into a database command. Because Applicants' claims now recite transforming the requests into a database command, Applicants' claims recite a tangible result. One example of support for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 20, lines 17-29.

The Examiner states:

**Claims 1, 10, and 15** recite limitation, "using said different requirements to determine whether to validate.. .", "generating a database command.. .in response to validated transaction. The step of the claim recites a determining step, which does not always provide a tangible result.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 15 to cancel the phrase "determine whether". The amended claims do not recite a "determining" step. In addition, claims 1, 10, and 15 recite a tangible result independently from the other features of these claims by claiming transforming the transaction requests into a database command. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is believed to be overcome, both by the cancellation of the phrase "determine whether" and by reciting transforming the transaction requests into a database command.

The Examiner states:

**Claims 2 and 3** recite limitation, "if said first (second) transaction has been validated, generating a database command.. ." The step of the claim recites a determining step (if), which does not always provide a tangible result.

Applicants' claim 2 has been canceled and its features incorporated into amended claim 1. As described above, Applicants' claim 1 has been amended to recite a tangible result. Therefore, since claim 3 depends from claim 1, claim 3 also recites a tangible result.

Similarly, Applicants' claim 11 has been canceled and its features incorporated into amended claim 10. Applicants' claim 16 has been canceled and its features incorporated into amended claim 15. As described above, Applicants' claims 10 and 15 have been amended to recite a tangible result. Therefore, since claim 12 depends from claim 10 and claim 17 depends from claim 15, claims 12 and 17 also recite a tangible result.

The Examiner states:

**Claim 10** is directed towards a computer readable medium or a propagated signal (amended spec: "a computer readable medium of.. . regardless of the particular type of signal bearing media.. ."). A signal while incapable of being perceived or touch is also incapable of providing a tangible result.

Applicants have amended the specification, page 24, lines 3-21, to cancel the language regarding "regardless of the particular type of signal-bearing media" and "transmission-type media".

The rejections of claims 1-8 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are believed to be overcome by the amendments to the claims and should be withdrawn.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-14, 16-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have canceled claims 6-8, 14, and 19-20.

Regarding claims 10-14, the Examiner states that "computer usable media" and "computer usable program code" are not disclosed in the specification. Applicants have amended these claims to describe a computer program product in a data processing system comprising a computer readable medium including instructions. Support for this amendment can be found in Applicants' specification on page 24, lines 3-21.

Applicants have amended the remaining claims. Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome by the amendments to the claims and should be withdrawn.

## **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5-8, 10, 13-15 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Georgalas et al.*, Data Storage System Interface, Publication No. US 2005/0216498, published September 29, 2005 (hereinafter "*Georgalas*") in view of *Davis et al.*, System and Methods for Managing Web Content and Behavior Rules Engine, Publication No. US 2004/0024888, published

February 5, 2004 (hereinafter "*Davis*"). Applicants have incorporated the features of claim 2 into claim 1, incorporated the features of claim 11 into claim 10, and incorporated the features of claim 16 into claim 15. Because claims 2, 11, and 16 were found to be allowable, Applicants believe all pending claims are in an allowable form. Therefore, the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

**IV. Objection to Claims**

The Examiner has stated that claims 2-4, 11-12 and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and 101 issues set forth in the February 22, 2007 Office Action.

The features of claim 2 have been incorporated into amended claim 1. The features of claim 11 have been incorporated into amended claim 10. The features of claim 16 have been incorporated into amended claim 15. Therefore, independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are believed to be in an allowable form.

**V. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss  
Reg. No. 36,975  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants